

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-69 are pending in the application. Claims 70-74 are new. No new matter has been added with the addition of these claims. Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-69 have been amended in this Amendment. By these amendments, Applicants do not acquiesce to the propriety of any of Examiner's rejections. Indeed, these amendments merely correct typographic errors. These amendments, therefore, do not disclaim any subject matter to which the Applicants are entitled. *Cf. Warner Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton-Davis Chem. Co.*, 41 USPQ2d 1865 (U.S. 1997). Indeed, these amendments are not intended to in any way narrow the subject the matter for which a patent is sought.

**I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

To properly maintain a rejection under Section 102, the Examiner must show that each and every limitation of the claims of the present invention is anticipated by the alleged prior art. *See In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1896 (Fed. Cir. 1991). None of the cited references anticipate the present invention as claimed.

**A. Rejection of claims 1-9 and 54-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Borza (US 5,995,630)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 54-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,995,630, issued to Borza ("*Borza*"). Paper No. 18, page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. *Borza* does not anticipate the claims of the present invention.

Specifically, *Borza* does not anticipate claims 1-9 because it does not disclose each and every element of those claims. *Borza* discloses a device that includes both a user input and a cryptographic keys storage device in one single device; that is the cryptographic key storage device is not remote from the user input. *Borza*, col. 8, lines 30-36. In contrast, claims 1-9 call for "a remotely accessible secure cryptographic system." Thus, *Borza* does not anticipate claims 1-9 because it does not disclose at least this element of those claims.

Furthermore, *Borza* does not anticipate claims 54-58 because it does not teach each and every element of those claims. For example, *Borza* does not teach, "receiving in a software module, substantially randomized sensitive data" or "receiving in a software module, substantially randomized data." Contrary to the Examiner's comment, *Borza* does

not teach or disclose that the registered biometric data disclosed is randomized sensitive data. Thus, *Borza* does not anticipate claims 54-58 because it does not disclose at least these elements of those claims.

**B. Rejection of claims 10-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Epstein (US 6,453,416)**

The Examiner rejected claims 10-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,453,416, issued to Epstein ("*Epstein*"). Paper No. 18, page 7. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. *Epstein* does not anticipate the claims of the present invention.

Specifically, *Epstein* does not anticipate claims 10-13 because it does not teach each and every element of those claims. *Epstein* discusses associating an individual user with a private key stored on the user's smartcard that is coupled with the user's computer. In contrast, claims 10-13 claim, "associating a user from multiple users with one or more keys from a plurality of private cryptographic keys stored on a secure server." Moreover, *Epstein* does not teach or disclose storing private cryptographic keys on a secure server. Thus, *Epstein* does not anticipate claims 10-13 because it does not disclose at least this element of those claims.

In addition, *Epstein* does not anticipate claims 14-35 because *Epstein* does not teach each and every element of those claims. For example, *Epstein* does not teach "a data splitting module," "a data assembling module," or anything functionally similar to either. Therefore, *Epstein* does not anticipate claims 14-35 because it does not teach at least these elements of claims 14-35.

*Epstein* also does not anticipate claim 36. *Epstein* states that the "second data item  $I_2$  is formed at block 62 by foreground process 124 hashing together document hash  $H_0$ , random number RN and user identifying data U to a fixed length of at least 128 bits (160 bits if SHA-1 is used). also the first data item  $I_1$ , is formed at block 64, which may occur earlier than as shown, by encrypting document hash  $H_0$  using the public key of the user." *Epstein* Col. 7 lines 18-24. With regard to the first data item, *Epstein* encrypts "document hash  $H_0$  using the public key of the user." In contrast, claim 36 claims "combining at said trust engine said authentication data with a first substantially random value to form a first combined value."

Thus, *Epstein* does not anticipate claim 36 because it does not teach at least this limitation of claim 36.

Furthermore, *Epstein* does not anticipate claim 37-44. For example, *Epstein* does not teach “creating a first pairing of said first set of bits with said third set of bits” or “creating a second pairing of said first set of bits with said fourth set of bits.” As such, *Epstein* does not anticipate claims 37-44 because *Epstein* does not teach at least these elements of claim 37-44.

Finally, *Epstein* does not anticipate claim 45-53 because *Epstein* does not teach each and every element of those claims. For instance, *Epstein* does not teach “creating a first pairing of said first substantially random value with said second combined value” or “creating a second pairing of said first substantially random value with said second substantially random value.” Therefore, *Epstein* does not anticipate claim 45-53 because it does not teach at least these elements of those claims

**C. Rejection of claims 59-69 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pang (US 6,446,204)**

The examiner rejected claims 59-69 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,446,204, issued to Pang *et al.* (*Pang*). Paper No. 18, page 17. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. *Pang* does not anticipate the claims of the present invention.

Specifically, *Pang* does not anticipate claims 59-64 because *Pang* does not teach each and every element of those claims. For example, *Pang* does not teach “a redundancy system which receives said authentication result of at least two of said authentication engines and determines whether said user has been uniquely identified.” Instead, for example, at col. 22, lines 65-67, *Pang* discloses the use of a single authentication engine, not the redundancy system of the claimed invention. Therefore, *Pang* does not anticipate claims 59-64 because it does not teach at least this limitation of those claims.

In addition, *Pang* does not anticipate claims 65-69. For instance, *Pang* does not teach “a second trust engine located at a different geographic location than said first trust engine....” Thus, *Pang* does not anticipate claims 59-69 because it does not teach each and every element of those claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have properly stated, traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot each of the Examiner's grounds for rejection. Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions or believes further discussion will aid examination and advance prosecution of the application, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the fees to undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-1067. If any extensions or fees are not accounted for, such extension is requested and the associated fee should be charged to our deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

September 9, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeff E. Schwartz  
Reg. No. 39,019

Preston Gates Ellis & Rouvelas Meeds LLP  
1735 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 661-3720  
Facsimile: (202) 331-1024